

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 20 are pending in the application.

Applicants have amended the figures to comply with 37 CFR § 1.84(p)(5).

Applicants have amended the specification to include reference numbers per the Examiner's request. Additionally, Applicants note the rejection to the specification and the request to define the term "SRG." However, Applicants did not use the term "SRG" in the present application.

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2002/0055853 to Macleod et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,341,310 issued to Leshem et al. Applicants respectfully traverse. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections and allow all pending claims.

Macleod discloses a multimedia call center operating system that stores interactions made between clients and agents for subsequent review based upon the time of the interaction.

Leshem discloses a directed graph illustrating interactions with a Web site.

Claim 1 recites, in part, "an event modeling engine interfaced with the event log module and operable to compile the event logs as a directed graph having a node for each labeled reference, the nodes interconnected by edges derived from the time stamps to order nodes according to a temporal relationship of customer interactions in a contact session through one or more of the contact mediums."

Claim 11 recites, in part, "compiling the contact sessions as a directed graph having a node associated with each product information labeled reference, the nodes interconnected by edges, each edge associated with a user interaction at two nodes within the predetermined time, the edges defining a path between nodes for each contact session."

Macleod and Leshem cannot make obvious Claims 1 and 11 because Macleod and Leshem fail to teach, disclose or suggest all elements recited by Claims 1 and 11. For example, neither Macleod nor Leshem teach, disclose or suggest a "directed graph having a node for each

labeled reference” as recited by Claim 1, or “a directed graph having a node associated with each product information labeled reference” as recited by Claim 11. Paragraph [0156] which the Examiner relies upon as disclosing this element presents icons that allow selection of a playback of the actual interaction, not a labeled reference for a product as recited by Claims 1 and 11. In the final office action response to arguments, the Examiner asserts that Leshem discloses these elements by disclosing that URLs are associated with each node. Applicants respectfully traverse. Disclosure of a URL associated with each node does not equate to a “product labeled reference” as recited by Claim 1 or “product information labeled reference” as recited by Claim 11. Further, Leshem only addresses mapping of a website, not mapping through plural contact mediums as is recited by Claims 1 and 11; Applicants respectfully point out that Leshem deals with only website interactions and no motivation exists to combine Leshem and Macleod for tracking product references across plural contact mediums. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections and allow Claims 1 and 11, as well as Claims 2-10 and 12-20 which depend respectively from Claims 1 and 11.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

The Commissioner is authorized to deduct any additional fees which may be necessary and to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 502264.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically submitted to the COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS via EFS on July 28, 2008.

/Robert W. Holland/

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert W. Holland/

Robert W. Holland
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 40,020